

1 WALTER WILHELM LAW GROUP
A Professional Corporation
2 Riley C. Walter #91839
Kathleen D. DeVaney #156444
3 Danielle J. Bethel #315945
205 East River Park Circle, Ste. 410
4 Fresno, CA 93720
Telephone: (559) 435-9800
5 Facsimile: (559) 435-9868
E-mail: *rileywalter@w2lg.com*
6 *Attorneys for Chapter 9 Counsel*

7 MCCORMICK, BARSTOW, SHEPPARD,
WAYTE & CARRUTH LLP
8 Todd A. Wynkoop, #308845
todd.wynkoop@mccormickbarstow.com
9 Ben Nicholson, #239893
ben.nicholson@mccormickbarstow.com
10 Shane G. Smith, #272630
shane.smith@mccormickbarstow.com
11 Vanessa M. Cohn, #314619
vanessa.cohn@mccormickbarstow.com
12 7647 North Fresno Street
Fresno, California 93720
13 Telephone: (559) 433-1300
Facsimile: (559) 433-2300
14 *Attorneys for District Counsel*

15 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
16 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, FRESNO DIVISION

17 In re
18 TULARE LOCAL HEALTHCARE
DISTRICT, dba TULARE REGIONAL
19 MEDICAL CENTER,
20 Debtor.
21 Tax ID # 94-6002897
Address: 869 N. Cherry Street
22 Tulare, CA 93274

23 HEALTHCARE CONGLOMERATE
ASSOCIATES, LLC,
24
25 Plaintiff,
v.
26 TULARE LOCAL HEALTHCARE
DISTRICT dba TULARE REGIONAL
27 MEDICAL CENTER,
28 Defendant.

Case No. 17-13797 (Chapter 9)
Adv. Proc. No.: 17-01095-B
DC No.: OHS-3

**TULARE LOCAL HEALTHCARE
DISTRICT DBA TULARE REGIONAL
MEDICAL CENTER’S OPPOSITION TO
HEALTHCARE CONGLOMERATE
ASSOCIATES, LLC’S MOTION TO
STRIKE PORTIONS OF ANSWER [ECF
26]**

Date: April 12, 2018
Time: 11:30 a.m.
Dept: Courtroom 13
Judge: Hon. Rene’ Lastreto II

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. Applicable Legal Standards Strongly Favor TRMC	2
1. HCCA Has Chosen a Disfavored Vehicle For Its Challenge to TRMC’s Answer	2
2. The “Fair Notice” Standard Poses a Minimal Check On the Sufficiency of Pleadings of Affirmative Defenses	3
B. TRMC Provides Fair Notice of Its Affirmative Defenses on Consideration of All the Pleadings	3
1. TRMC’s Affirmative Defenses of Comparative Fault (Third) and Fault of Third Parties (Fourth) Find Support in the Underlying Pleadings.....	3
2. TRMC’s Affirmative Defense of Mitigation (Fifth) Finds Support in the Underlying Pleadings	5
3. TRMC’s Affirmative Defenses of Waiver (Sixth), Estoppel (Seventh), and Laches (Eighth) Find Support in the Underlying Pleadings.....	5
4. TRMC’s Affirmative Defense of Independent, Intervening or Superseding Cause (Twelfth) Finds Support in the Underlying Pleadings	8
5. TRMC’s Affirmative Defenses of Illegal Contract (Eleventh), Unclean Hands (Thirteenth), and Unconscionable Contract (Sixteenth) Find Support in the Underlying Pleadings	9
6. TRMC’s Affirmative Defense of Unconstitutional Clauses (Seventeenth) Finds Support in the Underlying Pleadings	11
7. The Motion to Strike Should Be Denied As To TRMC’s Defenses Attacked on Grounds That They Lack Factual Support.....	12
C. HCCA Mischaracterizes TRMC’s Defenses As Mere Statements That HCCA Cannot Prove an Element of Its Affirmative Case, and Striking Them Will Only Encourage Further Irrelevant Motions from HCCA	12
D. TRMC Withdraws Certain Defenses In Order to Conserve Judicial Resources.....	15
III. CONCLUSION	15